

THE REHEARSAL.

1. The Union betwixt Church and State is *Accidental*, and *Federal*.
2. The Powers of Church and State Cannot Interfere, while Each keeps within its own Limits.
3. The Case of the Church and State giving CONTRARY Commands, as to Circumstances of Time, Place, &c.
4. The Instance given by the Rights at Edinburgh.
5. The Pope and Presbyterians Agree in the Encroachments of the Church upon the State. Two Sticks made one.
6. The Case of the Interfering of Duties.
7. Proves Both to be Duties. And Quite Overthrows what the Rights brings it for.
8. How to know what belongs to the Ecclesiastical, and what to the Civil Power.

SATURDAY, December 21. 1706.

Country-man. NOW, Master, you are to hear the Reasons by which the Book of the Rights wou'd Prove that what is *Faith* Can-be *Faith*, that is, That ther shou'd be two Independent Powers in the same Society.

(1.) *Rehearsal*. I might put him off by what I said in my last, That Church and State are two Societies, of Different Foundation, and of Different Laws. Tho' they may be United into One Society, in a Civil Respect, that is, when the State comes into the Church, and Professes the same Religion. But this is *Accidental*, and Alters not the Nature or Tenure of either Church or State; who may Part again, as several times they have done, and Each stand upon its own Bottom and Foundation, which therefore they cannot lose by their Union. And this makes it Rather a *Federal*, than an *Incorporating* Union, by which last all Distinct and Independent Powers are for ever Abolish'd and Extinguish'd.

But I will not Divert you from Giving the Mighty Reasons which are Offer'd in the Rights to Prove *Faith* to be an Impossibility.

(2.) *Country-m.* This is the Subject of the first Chapter. And the first Reason he gives, is, That these two Independent Powers may give CONTRARY Commands. Which then shall we Obey?

Rehears. They cannot give CONTRARY Commands, more than a Divine, a Physician, and a Lawyer. They Act in Different Spheres, and Respect Different things. To take care of my Soul, is not Inconsistent with the Health of my Body; And to Preserve my Health, Hurts not my Estate. Thus the Church takes care of Religion, and the State of Civil concerns, and these are not Contrary the one to the other. Nor can they ever Interfere, while each keeps within its own Limits. For Example, the State Condemns a

man for Murder, the Church, upon his Repentance, Absolves him; yet this hinders not the Sentence of the Law to pass upon him. So here is no Interfering. Because the Censure of the Church do's not Cramp the Sentence of the State, nor the Sentence of the State the Censure of the Church.

(3.) *Country-m.* But tho' they are not Contrary to one another, in the Nature of the Thing, or as to their Different Powers; yet they may Contradict one another, as to the Circumstances of Time, Place, &c. for Example, the King Commands me, upon his Service, to such a Place, and at such a Time. The Bishop Requires my Attendance, on Account of Religion, at the same Time, in another Place. I cannot Comply with Both, Which then shall I Neglect? This is the Case which the Rights puts at the Beginning of Chap. 1. And gives an Instance, p. 34. As it happen'd at Edinburg 1581. The Independent Kirk Commanding a Fast on the same Day the King had Oblig'd the Citizens to Treat the Ambassadors of the French King at a Splendid Dinner.

Rehears. The Church her self, and Consequently every Member of it, is oblig'd to Obey the King in all Lawful things. Thus Christ Himself did, and Consequently We must do. Therefore in the Case you put, I must Obey the King, and Attend at his Time and Place. But it is not to be suppos'd that any Bishop wou'd Command me from my Bounden Duty and Service to the King. Or if he did, it wou'd be an Unlawful Command, and I wou'd be Oblig'd to Disobey it. Or if it happen'd by Chance, the Bishop (suppos'd) not knowing what Command the King had given, the Bishop wou'd Excuse me for not Attending at his Time and Place, and wou'd Blame me, if I had done otherwise.

(+)

(4.) But as to the Instance he gives of that at Edinburgh, it was done *Knowingly* and on Purpose to *Affront* the King; for they knew the Command the King had given for Treating the Ambassador, and the very Sunday before they Proclaim'd the same Day a Fast, in Pure Opposition. Now this had been a great Sin, if the Church had done it, to *Disobey* the Lawful Command of the King, in an Affair that was of a Civil Nature, and properly belonging to his Office. And no Man had been oblig'd to Obey such an Unreasonable and Undutiful Command of the Church, and tending to Sedition, but rather to have Reprov'd it.

(5.) But this shews the true Spirit of the Kirk, which Hates all Kings, and all Government, but in their own Hands. And in this they join hands with Popery, which Entrenches upon the Civil Power; And by that, Tempts the Civil Power to Encroach upon the Church, not knowing how otherwise to Preserve it self. And the Inference wou'd be Just, for the State cou'd not be Preserv'd, if the Power of the Church were to be measur'd by the Principles and Practice of the Pope and the Presbyterians. Who, like Sampson's Foxes, draw two ways, but their Tails are Join'd with Fire-Brands; to set both Church and State in a Flame. And for this, not to Trouble you with Books, see a Sheet of Paper lately Printed, call'd, *Two Sticks made One*: Or, *The Devil upon Dun*; where their Words and Books are Quoted, agreeing Exactly in the Deposing Doctrine, and that by the Power of the Church, as well as of the People.

Country-m. I'll get one of these Sheets, and Hang it up in my Hall, as an Antidote against both Popery and Fanaticism.

But I think, Master, you have Clear'd the Point, as to the Interfering of Duties, in Relation to the Church and the State.

(6.) Rehears. There are Multitudes of Cases of Conscience as to this Point of the Interfering of Duties, where we cannot perform one Duty, without Neglecting another; And then which of them shall take Place? And by this Argument of the Rights, it wou'd follow, That ther cou'd be no Christian Duties at all? Nor Moral neither, for the same Objection lies as to them. Yet from hence the Rights wou'd Infer, that it is Impossible ther shou'd be two Independent Powers.

(7.) Country-m. But he has another Argument, That if ther were Two such Powers, the one might Encroach upon the Subjects of the other, the Church By Excommunicating the Subjects of the State; And, on the other hand, the State might hurt the Church, by Imprisoning, Banishing, or putting to Death her Members, or even the Bishops themselves.

Rehears. This is no News. This was the Case in all the Persecutions. But will it therefor follow, That ther were not Two such Independent Powers, when they did thus,

as it were, wage War with one another? One wou'd think it were a better Argument to Prove ther were Two such Powers, and even an invincible Demonstration of it. Yet here it is brought as an Argument, That ther Cou'd not be Two such Powers. And if it Cou'd not be, it never was, or ever Can be. What then is the Rights disputing about? To Guard us against Impossibilities! Let him tell us then what is the meaning of the Contents of his first Chapter, That ther Cannot be two Independent Powers in the same Society. If he had said, ther Ought not to have been Two such Powers, he might have given his Reasons. But to say, ther Cannot be, what he is Disputing against and Complains of, as now in Being, and cannot Deny but that it ever was so, is an Effort to Render him the Singular Man of the Age!

(8.) Country-m. This appears more monstrous than Observer himself! But pray, Master, hear out his Reasons. He puts a Difficulty, p. 34, 35. What is Civil, and what is Ecclesiastical? And asks who shall be Judge? If the Church, they may make every thing belong to the Ecclesiastical; And if the State, to the Civil Power.

Rehears. And they are Both in the Right.

Country-m. You Startle me, Master. How can Both be Right? Then the Church may say, this is an Ecclesiastical Matter, and belongs to me: And the State may say, no, it is a Civil matter, and belongs to me. And can Both these be Right?

Rehears. You will see, when you have Answer'd this Question. What can the Church do, supposing the matter to be Ecclesiastical? And what can the State do, supposing it to be Civil?

Country-m. The Church may pass her Censures. And the State Infix Temporal Penalties.

Rehears. And so they may do in all Cases. For Example, in Adultery, Murder, &c. the Church may Censure this as a Sin, and the State may Infix Temporal Penalties for the same. And the like as to Blasphemy, Idolatry, Heresie, and what may more Properly be call'd Spiritual Crimes. These two Powers of Church and State are not Distinguish'd by the Things about which they are Conversant, or wherein they may Exercise their Power; But by the Powers themselves; the One Extending to the other World, the other to this only; The One Affecting the Soul, the other the Body only. But these Different Powers may be Exercis'd about the self same Things, and upon the same Persons, And ther are neither Things nor Persons Exempt from Either of these Powers.

Country-m. Now I see the Ignorance or Malice of the Rights. He wou'd have such a set of Things to be Spiritual, and not Temporal; and others to be Temporal, and to have nothing to do with Spiritual. And then set the Church and State a Fighting about these, with, who shall be Judge?

ADVERTISEMENT.

A Parallel between the Faith and Doctrine of the present Quakers, and that of the Chief Hereticks in all Ages of the Church. And also a Parallel between Quakerism and Popery.